

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	4707494
Application Number:	09756788
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	6599
Title of Invention:	System and method for providing shopping aids and incentives to customers through a computer network
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	Michael C. Scroggie
Customer Number:	31518
Filer:	Richard A. Neifeld
Filer Authorized By:	
Attorney Docket Number:	CAT/29US-SCRCO3
Receipt Date:	30-JAN-2009
Filing Date:	10-JAN-2001
Time Stamp:	14:40:52
Application Type:	Utility under 35 USC 111(a)

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment		no			
File Listing:					
Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Petition for review by the Office of Petitions.	PetitionInResponseToNoticeOf NonCompliance_CAT29USSCR CO3_1-27-2009.pdf	104105 <small>404a70800a6db4b215a0811124aa772c10ff7848</small>	no	10
Warnings:					
Information:					

This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.

New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111

If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.

National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371

If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.

New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office

If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.

Neifeld Docket No: CAT29US-SCRCO3

Application/Patent No: 09/756,788

USPTO CONFIRMATION NO: 6599

File/Issue Date: January 10, 2001

Inventor/Title: MICHAEL C. SCROGGIE ET AL./System and Method for Providing Shopping Aids and Incentives to Customers Through a Computer Network

Examiner/ArtUnit: JANVIER/3688

ENTITY STATUS: LARGE

**37 CFR 1.7(c) FILING RECEIPT AND TRANSMITTAL LETTER WITH
AUTHORIZATION TO CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT**

**1. THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY FEES
WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT, TO DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NUMBER 50-2106.**

2. FEES PAID HERewith BY EFS CREDIT CARD SUBMISSION: \$420

A. CLAIMS FEES

0.00 \$ - (claims previously paid for; currently present; \$50 per addl. claim over 20.)

0.00 \$ - (independent previously paid for; currently present; \$200 per addl. claim over 3)

B. OTHER FEE \$

3. THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS ARE SUBMITTED HERewith:

37 CFR 1.181 (a)(3) Petition to the Director to Invoke Supervisory Authority

4. FOR INTERNAL NEIFELD IP LAW, PC USE ONLY

USPTO CHARGES: \$
CLIENT BILLING MATTER: CAT29USSCRO
BANK ACCOUNT/Check: 3/
G/L ACCOUNT:

FIRM CHARGES: \$
DESCRIPTION: FIRM CHARGE FOR
paying the increased gov. fee. for NOA
and appeal
LAWYER: ran

INITIALS OF PERSON WHO **ENTERED** ACCOUNTING DATA: ran

ATTORNEY SIGNATURE (AUTHORIZING DEPOSIT ACCOUNT)

DATE: 1-27-2009

SIGNATURE: /RichardNeifeld#35,299/

Richard Neifeld, Reg. No. 35,299

Printed: January 30, 2009 (2:33pm)

Y:\Clients\Catalina\CAT-29US-SCRO\CAT29US-SCRCO3\Drafts\PetitionInResponseToNoticeOfNonCompliance_CAT29USSCRO3_1-27-2009.wpd

Neifeld Docket No: CAT29US-SCRCO3

Application/Patent No: 09/756,788

USPTO CONFIRMATION NO: 6599

File/Issue Date: January 10, 2001

Inventor/Title: MICHAEL C. SCROGGIE ET AL./System and Method for Providing Shopping Aids and Incentives to Customers Through a Computer Network

Examiner/ArtUnit: JANVIER/3688

ENTITY STATUS: LARGE/3688

37 CFR 1.181 (A)(3) PETITION TO THE DIRECTOR TO INVOKE SUPERVISORY
AUTHORITY

I. STATEMENT OF THE RELIEF REQUESTED

The applicant requests that the 1/27/2009 Notice of Non Compliant Appeal Brief be withdrawn and the examiner instructed to issue a response on the merits to the Appeal filed 10/23/2008.

The applicant requests that this case be transferred to another examiner and to another SPE.

II. STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITION

1 On 1/21/2003, the office mailed an office action naming Examiner Gravini, which examined and rejected claims 32-58. This office action was indicated to be NON final.

2 On 5/21/2003, the office mailed an office action naming Examiner Gravini, which examined and rejected claims 32-58. This office action was indicated to be final.

3 On 9/9/2003, the Tech Center director mailed a letter noting that the 5/21/2003 office action had been expunged because "inappropriate comments were made by the examiner."
This was the first instance of impropriety in this case.

4 On 9/17/2003, the office mailed an office action naming Examiner Gravini, which examined and rejected claims 32-58. This office action was indicated to be final.

5 On 3/14/2004, the applicant filed an appeal.

6 On 5/4/2004, the office mailed an office action naming Examiner Gravini, and examining claims 32-91. This office action reopened prosecution after an appeal. This office action was improperly indicated to be final.

This was the second instance of impropriety in this case.

7 On 7/15/2004, the applicant filed a petition to have the improper finality of the 5/4/2004 office action removed.

8 On 8/4/2004, the applicant requested reinstatement of the appeal.

9 On 8/27/2004, the Tech center director mailed a decision granting the petition to remove the finality status, vacating the finality, entering the appeal brief and notice of appeal filed 8/4/2004, and instructing the examiner to consider the appeal brief filed 8/4/2004.

10 On 10/29/2004, the office mailed an office action naming Examiner Janvier, which improperly required restriction between 3 allegedly distinct inventions for claims 32-91. This action was indicated to be NON final.

This was the third instance of impropriety in this case.

11 On 1/18/2005, the applicant filed a response to the 10/29/2004 requirement, with traverse.

12 On 1/18/2005, the applicant also filed a supplemental appeal brief and request to reinstate the appeal.

13 On 2/3/2005, the applicant filed a petition against the restriction requirement and to reinstate the supplemental appeal brief filed 8/4/2004.

14 On 4/18/2005, the office mailed an office action naming Examiner Janvier, which examined and objected to claims 32-91. This office action stated that it 'vacated' the prior office action. However, it contained ONLY a new improper requirement for restriction, this time a more burdensome requirement listing 5 allegedly distinct inventions.

This was the fourth instance of impropriety in this case.

15 On 6/24/2005, the applicant filed a response to the second election requirement, a notice of appeal, and a third supplemental appeal brief listing all claims, with request to reinstate the appeal.

16 On 7/1/2005, the applicant filed a petition against the 4/18/2005 improper restriction requirement and to reinstate the third supplement appeal brief filed 6/24/2005.

17 On 9/21/2006, the office mailed a paper, Notification of Non Compliant Appeal Brief, naming Examiner Janvier, improperly requiring a listing of support for each dependent claim argued separately.

This was the fifth instance of impropriety in this case.

18 On 10/17/2006, the applicant filed a response to the 9/21/2006 notice, traversing the requirements in the notice, and filing a paper titled "Fourth Supplemental Appeal Brief".

19 On 9/17/2008, the office mailed a paper naming Examiner Janvier, reopening prosecution, examining claims 32-91, and rejecting those claims. This office action is was indicated to be NON final.

20 On 9/28/2008, the applicant an amendment and evidence in support thereof.

21 On 10/23/2008, the applicant reinstated the appeal, filing a new notice of appeal and appeal brief.

22 On 1/27/2009, the office mailed a paper signed by Examiner Janvier, Notice of Non Compliant Appeal Brief. This paper improperly states that:

This Application is not in condition for Appeal. Indeed, the filing of an Appeal Brief in the Instant Application is premature. On 09/17/08, the Office mailed a Non-Final Action to the Applicant. On 09/29/08, the Applicant filed a request for reconsideration, under 37 CFR 1.111, consisting of a claim amendment and arguments. Even before, the Examiner issues a response to the 1.111 reply, Applicant filed on 10/23/08 a Notice of Appeal together with an Appeal Brief. Here, the Applicant can either render the 1.111 reply null and void to thereby proceed with the Appeal Brief after updating the said Appeal or withdraw the Appeal and have the 1.111 reply considered by the Examiner.

This is the sixth instance of impropriety in this case.

23 On or about 1/27/2009, I left voicemail messages with the examiner and the SPE listed in the last office action for the examiner, requesting that they withdraw the Notice and thereby moot this petition. On 1/28/2009, SPE James Myhre left me a voicemail indicating that he was now the SPE on this case.

24 On 1/29/2009, I left two long voicemails for Examiner Janvier explaining the basis why the Notice was improper and noting each of the other improper actions identified in the facts section of this petition, and requesting he timely withdraw the Notice in order to moot a need to file this petition. The examiner left me voicemail messages in response to my vm reiterating the reasons for the Notice.

25 On 1/29/2009, I spoke via telephone with SPE Myhre and requested that he withdraw the outstanding Notice. I explained why. I explained that Ex Parte Lemoine and the rules authorizing an appeal provided a right of appeal any time an application for patent was rejected two or more times. SPE Myhre disagreed. SPE Myhre indicated he thought the notice was proper because the claims now appealed have not been examined, and appeal prior to examiner of claims is improper. SPE Myhre also indicated that if he decided this petition, he would deny it.

26 The applicant is, with another paper filed concurrently with this petition, file a paper complying with the notice, with traverse, only because failure to do so will result in the examiner improperly holding the application abandoned, pursuant to the outstanding Notice deadline, 2/26/2009.

27 35 USC 132(a) states that:

35 U.S.C. 132 Notice of rejection; reexamination.

(a) Whenever, on examination, any claim for a patent is rejected, or any objection or requirement made, the Director shall notify the applicant thereof,

stating the reasons for such rejection, or objection or requirement, together with such information and references as may be useful in judging of the propriety of continuing the prosecution of his application; and if after receiving such notice, the applicant persists in his claim for a patent, with or without amendment, the application shall be reexamined. No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. [Underlining added for emphasis.]

28 35 USC 134(a) states that:

35 U.S.C. 134 Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

(a) PATENT APPLICANT.— An applicant for a patent, any of whose claims has been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the primary examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, having once paid the fee for such appeal. [Underlining added for emphasis.]

29 Ex parte Lemoine states in relevant part that:

To reach a decision requires to construe the word "claims" as used in § 134. The word is susceptible to at least two interpretations. It can refer to the claims of an application, i.e., the "one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter" of the invention required by 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2. Or the word can be used in a more general sense to refer to claims "for a patent" as it is used in 35 U.S.C. § 132. In this latter sense, the word is synonymous with a request or demand for a patent. Section 134 merely uses the word "claims." We must, therefore, decide which construction to give to the statute. We conclude that "claims" in § 134 should be construed consistently with its use in § 132 to mean "claims for a patent" rather than particular "claims of an application."

Section 134 is part of Chapter 12 of Title 35. Chapter 12 is titled "Examination of Application" and sets forth the general procedures to be followed in the Office for examination. Sections 131 to 134 provide the general procedures relating to ex parte examination. In relevant part, these sections specify that (1) an examination shall be made (§ 131); (2) if "any claim for a patent" is rejected, the applicant shall be informed of the bases of the rejection (§ 132); (3) if the applicant persists in the "claim for a patent, with or without amendment," the application shall be reexamined (§ 132); and (4) if applicant's claims have been twice rejected, the applicant may appeal (§ 134). Considering these sections together, we conclude that the "claims" as used in § 134 is a reference to the

repeated "claim for a patent" as used in § 132 rather than a reference to a particular claim "of an application." Under our interpretation, so long as the applicant has twice been denied a patent, an appeal may be filed. So construing the statute, we conclude that applicant's claims for a patent have been twice rejected. Applicant has been denied a patent three times. Applicant, therefore, had the right to appeal and we, accordingly, have jurisdiction. [*Ex parte Lemoine*, 46 USPQ2d 1420, ___ (PTOBPAI 1994)(precedential decision of a BPAI expanded panel, 12/27/1994). Underlining and italics added for emphasis.]

30 37 CFR 41.37(a) specifies the rule depending from 34 USC 134(a), stating that:

§ 41.31 Appeal to Board.

(a) Who may appeal and how to file an appeal. (1) Every applicant, any of whose claims has been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the examiner to the Board by filing a notice of appeal accompanied by the fee set forth in § 41.20(b)(1) within the time period provided under § 1.134 of this title for reply. [Underlining added for emphasis.]

31 37 CFR 41.31 was promulgated in the Final Rule published 8/14/2004, at 69 FR 49960.

32 Comment 36 in the Final Rule published 8/14/2004 states that:

Comment 36: One comment suggests that §§ 41.31(a)(1), (a)(2) and (a)(3) be amended to provide for appeal at any time after being twice or finally rejected, as appropriate, during pendency of the proceeding where no time period under § 1.134 is running. The comment states that the suggested change would ensure that § 41.31 would not be interpreted more restrictively than 35 U.S.C. 134, which sets forth no condition regarding when an appeal can be filed, apart from the requirements for claims being twice rejected (as in 35 U.S.C. 134(a)) or finally rejected (as in 35 U.S.C. 134(b) and (c)). *The comment also states that this amendment would prevent any potential inconsistency of the rules with the Board's precedential opinion, Ex parte Lemoine, 46 USPQ2d 1420, 1423 (BPAI 1994).*

Answer: The suggestion will not be adopted. Sections 41.31(a)(1), (a)(2) and (a)(3) were proposed to generally incorporate the requirements of former § 1.191(a) (2003) and to subdivide § 1.191(a) into three parts to improve readability. Both former § 1.191(a) (2003) and §§ 41.31(a)(1), (a)(2) and (a)(3) are more restrictive than 35 U.S.C. 134 in that an appeal must be filed within the time period provided under § 1.134 for response to either a final rejection or a non-final rejection which rejects the claims for a second time, as appropriate. For example, an applicant for a patent whose claims have been twice rejected but not finally rejected, may appeal from the decision of the examiner to the Board by

filing a notice of appeal accompanied by the fee set forth in § 41.20(b)(1) within the time period provided under § 1.134. However, if such an applicant files an amendment within the time period provided under § 1.134, the applicant may not file an appeal *outside the time period provided under § 1.134*. In such a situation, the applicant must wait for a new rejection by the examiner before an appeal can be filed. [69 FR 49974 right hand column; bold and italics added for emphasis.]

33 The USPTO posts all of the BPAI's precedential decision on its web site:
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/prec.htm>

34 As of 1/29/2008, there are only 17 such decisions.

III. REASONS WHY THE RELIEF REQUESTED SHOULD BE GRANTED

A. WHY THE NOTICE SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN AND THE APPEAL FILED 1023/2008 SHOULD BE REINSTATED

The appeal brief filed 10/23/2008 was after applicant's claim for a patent had been twice or more rejected. Facts 1-19. As clearly explained in *Ex parte Lemoine*, 35 USC 134(a) specifies that an applicant has the right to appeal any time their *application* has been twice or more rejected, which is the case here. Facts 27-29. As in *Lemoine*, the existence of amended claims is not relevant to the right to appeal. Accord: Appeal Nos: 20074469; 20061027, available from the BPAI web site of final decisions.

Moreover, the appeal brief filed 10/23/2008 was "within the time period provided under § 1.134" as required by 41.31(a). Facts 19-21. Therefore, as clearly stated in comment 36, the appeal was not "*outside the time period provided under § 1.134*". Fact 32.

Fact 32, comment 36 on rule 41.31 states that "However, if such an applicant files an amendment within the time period provided under § 1.134, the applicant may not file an appeal *outside the time period provided under § 1.134*". This example clearly and unequivocally means that, if the applicant does file an amendment and an appeal, and both are within the time for responding to the office action, then the appeal is proper. Accordingly, the appeal is proper and the Notice is improper. Therefore, the applicant had the right under rule 41.31, 35 USC 134(a), and *Ex parte Lemoine*, to file the appeal.

Moreover, the ultimatum in the Notice is unprecedented, and the examiner identified no authority in support of the right to make such an ultimatum. This indicates a disregard for authority, and a disregard for the propriety of the action.

Furthermore, the examiner has the right under the rules now in force to reply in an answer with a new ground of rejection to address amended claims. 37 CFR 41.39(a)(1), added, 69 FR 49959, Aug. 12, 2004, effective Sept. 13, 2004 (noting that rules intended to go into force 12/2008 were indefinitely suspended and are not in force.) Accordingly, there is no policy reason for the examiner to be allowed to violate the rules to force the applicant to withdraw the appeal or amendment.

Still further, leaving the most recent improper Notice undisturbed detracts from applicants substantive rights by further delaying the date this application will issue as a patent.

Finally, given that patent term adjustment depends upon duration of appeal, and upon delays due to the filing of correcting papers. Therefore, the examiner's requirement will affect the applicants substantive right to duration of patent term once this application issues.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the Notice should be withdrawn and the appeal filed 10/23/2008 considered.

B. WHY THIS CASE AND ALL RELATED CASES SHOULD BE REASSIGNED

The applicant has in all respects followed the rules of practice and acted properly in this application. The examiner's have shown disregard for applicants rights and binding procedure. Facts 1-34.

The applicant documents in the facts section 6 instances of procedural actions shown to be clearly be improper by the fact that papers containing those actions were either expunged by the Tech Center director, held to be improper in a decision on petition, withdrawn by the examiner sua sponte, or clearly explained by the applicant on the record why they were improper. Facts 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 22-25. Given this pattern of the examiners' lack of compliance with procedure and disregard for binding law, and applicants consistent success in reversing the improper actions thereby requiring the examiner to do additional work in examining this application, it is questionable whether the examiners can maintain objectivity, or have been objective, in examining this application.

Failing to re assign an application in which an applicant has a reason to believe that the examiners cannot maintain objectivity, and where that reasoning is based upon objective facts, has the detrimental effect of dampening challenges to improper action and embolden examiners to act improperly in the future, contrary to public policy.

The applicant therefore requests that the Director re-assign this case to a different primary and a different supervisory examiner.

Please note that the undersigned considered requesting all cases assigned to the same examiner, and either represented by the undersigned or assigned to the same assignee as the instant application be transferred. However, the undersigned believes that transfer of this single case, and the reasons therefore brought to the attention of the examiner, are sufficient, at this time.

C. SUMMARY

The Notice should be withdrawn as clearly improper. This case should be re-assigned to different examiners to avoid the applicant's objective fear of non objective examination.

1-30-2009

DATE:

/RichardNeifeld#35,299/

SIGNATURE:

Richard Neifeld, Reg. No. 35,299

Attorney of record

ran

January 30, 2009 (2:33pm)

Y:\Clients\Catalina\CAT-29US-SCRO\CAT29US-SCRCO3\Drafts\PetitionInResponseToNotice
OfNonCompliance_CAT29USSCRO3_1-27-2009.wpd